

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box, 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/054,162	01/18/2002	Siu Choon Ng	4810-62169	5351	
7590 04/29/2005			EXAMINER		
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP			THERKORN, ERNEST G		
One World Trac	de Center				
Suite 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
121 S. W. Salmon Street			1723		
Portland, OR 97204			DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
_		10/054,162	NG ET AL.	
0	ffice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
· .		Ernest G. Therkorn	1723	
<i> The</i> Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communication app bly	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence addre	ss
THE MAILI - Extensions o after SIX (6) - If the period f - If NO period f - Failure to rep Any reply rec	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. If time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. For reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period willy within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eived by the Office later than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a repl within the statutory minimum of thirty (i will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. 5 from the mailing date of this commi	unication.
Status	•			
2a)⊠ This 3)⊡ Since	onsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Fe</u> action is FINAL . 2b) This e this application is in condition for alloward in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matter	•	erits is
Disposition of	Claims			
4a) O 5) ☐ Claim 6) ☑ Claim 7) ☐ Claim	n(s) 35-37,45 and 48-54 is/are pending in f the above claim(s) is/are withdraven(s) is/are allowed. n(s) 35-37, 45 and 48-54 is/are rejected. n(s) is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Pa	pers			•
10)⊡ The d Applic Repla	pecification is objected to by the Examine rawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accessant may not request that any objection to the occurrent drawing sheet(s) including the correction ath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance on is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	• •
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)□ AⅡ 1.□ 2.□ 3.□	owledgment is made of a claim for foreign b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau e attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in App ity documents have been re (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Sta	ge
Jee an	o attabiled detailed Office action for a list (or the certified copies not re	JEIVEU.	
Attachment(s)				
2)	ferences Cited (PTO-892) Iftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Mail Date		mary (PTO-413) lail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)

Application/Control Number: 10/054,162

Art Unit: 1723

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35-37, 45, and 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) in view of Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) and either Armstrong (Anal. Chem. 1990, 62, 1610-1615) or Hargitai (Journal of Chromatography, 628 (1993), pages 11-22). At best, the claims differ from Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) in the clarity of reciting a saccharide that is fully functionalized and a moiety that is able to bind to a support. Armstrong (Anal. Chem. 1990, 62, 1610-1615) (page 1610, column 2, line 15-page 1611, column 1, line 8 and the paragraph under "Results and Discussion" on page 1611, column 2) discloses it is desirable to maximize the functionalization of cyclodextrin because that increases its ability to resolve enantiomers under normal phase conditions. Hargital (Journal of Chromatography, 628 (1993), pages 11-22) (Abstract and page 22, lines 6-11) discloses that maximizing functionalization was the most important factor for enantioselectivity. Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) (column 2, lines 10-19; column 2, line 60-column 3, line 6; and column 3, lines 41-51) discloses forming a silane derivative results in a product that is universally applicable to HPLC, LC, TLC, and CLE and permits immobilization on a support material surface. It would have been obvious to fully fuctionalize the cyclodextrin in Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) either because Armstrong (Anal. Chem. 1990, 62, 1610-1615) (page 1610, column 2, line 15-page

Art Unit: 1723

1611, column 1, line 8 and the paragraph under "Results and Discussion" on page 1611, column 2) discloses it is desirable to maximize the functionalization of cyclodextrin because that increases its ability to resolve enantiomers under normal phase conditions or because Hargitai (Journal of Chromatography, 628 (1993), pages 11-22) (Abstract and page 22, lines 6-11) discloses that maximizing functionalization was the most important factor for enantioselectivity. It would have been obvious to form a silane derivative for binding in Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) because Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) (column 2, lines 10-19; column 2, line 60-column 3, line 6; and column 3, lines 41-51) discloses forming a silane derivative results in a product that is universally applicable to HPLC, LC, TLC, and CLE and permits immobilization on a support material surface.

The remarks urge that there is no reasonable expectation of success combining Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) and Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) because Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) is limited to a particular type of linker. However, Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750) discloses linking to a support on column 19, line 34-column 20, line 24. The only requirement of Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750)'s column 20, line 6 linker is that it is suitable. As such, there is a reasonable expectation of success of using Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458)'s linker in Lincoln (U.S. Patent No. 5,324,750).

The remarks urge that Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) (column 2, lines 10-19; column 2, line 60-column 3, line 6; and column 3, lines 41-51) does not disclose forming a silane derivative results in a product that is universally applicable to HPLC, LC, TLC,

Art Unit: 1723

and CLE and permits immobilization on a support material surface. However, Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) (column 2, lines 10-19) discloses that his linkages are universally applicable to HPLC, LC, TLC, and CLE. A fair reading of Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) (column 2, line 60-column 3, line 6 and column 3, lines 41-51) indicates that those linkages are formed with silanes. As such, Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,458) (column 2, lines 10-19; column 2, line 60-column 3, line 6; and column 3, lines 41-51) discloses forming a silane derivative results in a product that is universally applicable to HPLC, LC, TLC, and CLE and permits immobilization on a support material surface.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to E. Therkorn at telephone number (571) 272-1149. The official fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/054,162

Art Unit: 1723

Page 5

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ernest G. Therkorn Primary Examiner Art Unit 1723

Ornet 6th low

EGT April 27, 2005